

### Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-12 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Mann, II et al. (US Patent No. 5,577,186).

In the portion of the office action addressing the rejection and in the response to arguments, the office action states that Mann discloses a system tied to a core curriculum subject matter of art and graphical design and refers to Figure 3, reference number 53. This is not really tied to core curriculum subject matter, as the application being learned in this example in Mann is a graphics application and the lesson contents are related to the graphics application, not core curriculum subject matter of art or graphics design. See Mann, column 7, lines 1-3, "However, *depending upon the application*, the chapter/lesson selection screen 53 could also be continuously displayed [emphasis added]." This shows that the lesson contents are based upon the application being taught, such as the example of Paintbrush, a graphics package.

Further, Mann does not teach that either the objectives of the course are related to national or state technology education standards, or that the core curriculum subject matter used is related to technology objectives. Amended claims 1, 8, 17 and 19 include these limitations, which are supported in the specification on page 3, lines 10-24; page 4, lines 1-8; page 9, lines 10-16; among others.

Amended claims 1 and 17 require that the "the problem is tied to either national or state educational standards in at least one core curriculum subject matter," the performance is evaluated using technology objectives derived from educational technology standards." Amended claims 8 and 19 require the problem to be tied to "either national or state standards in at least one core curriculum subject matter." These elements are not shown taught or

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

suggested by Mann. It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 8, 17 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2 and 6-7 depend from claim 1, and claims 9 and 10-12 depend from claim 8. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 3-5, 9, 13-16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann in view of Cook et al. (US Patent No. 5,727,950).

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and claims 9 and 13 depend from claim 8. Cook does not overcome the deficiency of Mann with regard to the base claims as discussed above. Therefore the combination of references does not teach, show or suggest the subject matter of these claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 3-5, 9 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 14 and 16 have been amended in a similar fashion to claims 1, 8, 17 and 19 above. These claims now require that technology objectives based upon national or state educational technology objectives are used, and that the core curriculum subject matter is related to either national or state standards for core curriculum. As discussed above, Mann does not show, teach nor suggest this, and Cook does not overcome this deficiency.

It is therefore submitted that claims 14 and 16 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and inherently includes all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that

claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

### Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison St., Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and  
Trademark Office via facsimile number  
571-273-8300, on January 4, 2006.

Signature

*Lauren Ballard-Gemmell*  
Lauren Ballard-Gemmell